

**SUPPORT for RB 6491 AN ACT CONCERNING NONLETHAL ELECTRONIC
DEFENSE WEAPONS.**

To Co-Chair Winfield, Co-Chair Stafstrom, Vice Chair Kasser, Vice Chair Blumenthal
and all members of the Judiciary Committee:

I wish to lend my **SUPPORT** for RB 6491. All non-restricted citizens have a **right to self-defense** and non-lethal electronic self-defense weapons can be a good option for those who **choose to not carry a firearm**. As a **non-lethal** option, I cannot see anyone opposing this.

In **Caetano v Massachusetts**, The Supreme Court of the United States said that "the Second Amendment extends, prima facie, to all instruments that constitute bearable arms, even those that were not in existence at the time of the founding". I call your attention to this case because it **states that laws restricting nonlethal electronic defense weapons are unconstitutional**.

The subject of this case, Jaime Caetano, is **alive and unharmed** because she simply *displayed* a stun gun when threatened by her abusive ex-boyfriend. Had she not, her fate may have been less fortunate.

I will leave you with the words of Judge Samuel Alito. "If the fundamental right of self-defense does not protect Caetano, then the safety of all Americans is left to the mercy of state authorities who may be more concerned about disarming people than about keeping them safe".

Please **SUPPORT RB 6491**

Respectfully,

Dr. Walter Kupson

Middlebury